

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/866,557		BEACH ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D.		1637	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D. (3) _____

(2) Matthew Vincent (4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 March 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner telephone Mr. Vincent for Applicant to discuss the previous restriction requirements. The examiner informed Mr. Vincent that two different restriction requirements were submitted to Applicant and two different elections were made. However, the restriction requirements were not clear on the record because the second restriction requirement made final the first election and did not vacate the first restriction requirement in lieu of the second restriction requirement. Since the record is confusing, the examiner informed Mr. Vincent that a new restriction requirement would be issue and both previous restriction requirements would be vacated in lieu of the new office action.